



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,091	05/30/2006	Karl-Heinz Hiller	66711001/04.049P-WO/US	1760
25005	7590	02/24/2010	EXAMINER	
Intellectual Property Dept. Dewitt Ross & Stevens SC 2 East Mifflin Street Suite 600 Madison, WI 53703-2865			COHEN, LEE S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3739	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/24/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket-ip@dewittross.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/596,091	Applicant(s) HILLER ET AL.	
	Examiner Lee S. Cohen	Art Unit 3739	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/30/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3739

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claim 19 stands withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on December 16, 2009.

The traversal is not found persuasive because the claimed structure is still considered to limited to the Figure 5 embodiment.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 9 is indefinite in that an electrode catheter is the claimed invention which is exclusive of an implantable defibrillator. If a combination is to be claimed, it should be set forth in a separate claim not dependent upon claim 1. Claim 10 is vague as to what additional structure is presented. Claims 11 and 14 are absent any positive method steps (i.e., performing electrotherapy, detecting electrical potentials, performing magnetic resonance imaging, etc.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 3739

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 10, 11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Harris (4,721,118). The reference discloses an electrotherapy lead (electrostimulation) including carbon fibers. Applicant's attention is directed to the various Figures, column 3, line 27- column 4, line 17, and column 6, lines 12-17. The addition of barium sulfate is disclosed at column 3, line 65+. Various statements relating to use of the electrodes for ablation or sensing are merely intended use which the electrode of Harris is inherently capable of effecting.

Claims 1-3, 6, 9, 10, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Brabec et al (2004/0111141). Applicant's attention is directed to Figure 1 as well as the Abstract, paragraphs [0011]-[0014], [0020], [0033], and claims 10 and 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-8, 14-17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris (4,721,118). Particular dimensions and material are well known and would have been obvious design expedients to the skilled artisan to select to optimize performance since a

Art Unit: 3739

predictable result would ensue. Further, as noted supra, column 6 discloses the use of bipolar electrodes. To employ carbon fibers for the second electrode conductor would have been an obvious design expedient given the teaching of Harris since a predictable result would ensue. The diameter of the second conductor is also deemed to have been an obvious design expedient to optimize performance of the device since different diameter conductors are well known in the art.

Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 11-14, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brabec et al (2004/0111141) in view of Harris (4,721,118). As noted supra, Harris adds barium sulfate to effect viewing during imaging. Given this teaching, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to add such material to the lead of Brabec et al to permit viewing during conventional magnetic resonance imaging. Particular dimensions and material are well known and would have been obvious design expedients to the skilled artisan to select to optimize performance since a predictable result would ensue.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lee S. Cohen whose telephone number is 571-272-4763. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on 571-272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3739

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Lee S. Cohen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3739

/Lee S. Cohen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3739
February 1, 2010